

Comments on Reassessment of FCC RF Exposure Limits and Policies,
ET Docket No. 13-84 and Proposed Changes in FCC Rules Regarding
Human Exposure to RF Electromagnetic Fields, ET Docket no.03-137

August 28, 2013

All of my adult life I have been an active participant in public processes, attending meetings, speaking at events, commenting during periods of public participation.

I find it an embarrassment and a scandal that this United States of America, where we celebrate and fight for freedom and equal rights, uses ELF and RF 'guidelines' to disenfranchise citizens. FCC guidelines for RF/MW exposure based on thermal effects are inadequate, out-dated and wrongful. Using SAR and SAR to shield industry profits is an outrage. There can be no other reason for this agency to try to cling to standards which are not protective of public health and are especially harmful to sensitive populations.

You have received thousands of peer-reviewed reports and studies which provide you proof of damage from low-level exposure to non-thermal radiation sources and urge adoption of biologically-based exposure guidelines. The 2012 BioInitiative Report is incorporated by reference herein in its entirety(<http://www.bioinitiative.org>)

How is it that only the United States and Canada retain these high-level guidelines while the rest of the world listens and learns? The FCC's power density value should be lowered from $1,000\text{uW}/\text{cm}^2$ to $0.0003\text{uW}/\text{cm}^2$.

In my own experience, I find I am sickened to a point of being unable to attend meetings at the Board of Supervisors, the CPUC, local agencies, and other venues such as stores, markets, even outdoor celebrations, where Wifi and RF signals and transmissions are unrestricted. I first notice a sharp and blinding headache, my eyes feel pressure, then my skin reddens and begins to swell. Next comes nausea and finally, my heart rhythms are affected. I find being so limited in where I can go and in what I can participate very-unAmerican. Per No. 09-5761 Heartwood, Inc., et al. v. Agpaoa, et al. I challenge the current exposure guidelines because I have suffered an 'injury in fact' that is concrete and particularized; is actual or imminent; is traceable to wireless exposure; and it is likely that this injury will be redressed by

lower exposure guidelines.

What is the cost of this disenfranchisement and ill health? I suggest that public discontent is counterproductive and ought to be a matter worthy of FCC consideration. I suggest this be full, careful, and appropriate consideration.

The FCC may not be a health and safety agency, but if you solicit comment, you indicate an intention to read what is sent you. This is in the public interest. That you are able to acknowledge the error of the current guidelines also is a representation of the public interest. The FCC should advocate that Congress direct the EPA to establish biologically-based radiofrequency (RF) radiation safety limits and provide the budget and resources to carry out that task.

Further, this proceeding requires a NEPA assessment due to reports of injury traceable to radiofrequency (RF) exposure under existing guidelines, which establishing biologically-based RF safety limits would prevent.

Thank you.

Garril Page
70 Fawn Drive
San Anselmo CA 94960